



8

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
STAFF REPORT

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS PUBLIC HEARING

DATE OF HEARING: September 13, 2010

ZMOD 2008-0010 – Ashburn Village Shopping Center Comprehensive Sign Plan

ELECTION DISTRICT: Broad Run DECISION DEADLINE: September 13, 2010

PROJECT PLANNER: Stephen Gardner DIRECTOR: Julie Pastor

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Saul Holdings Limited Partnership of Bethesda, Maryland has submitted an application for a special exception to modify the applicable provisions of Section 5-1204 of the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance to implement a Comprehensive Sign Package that proposes changes to the permitted number, size, height, location, and illumination of signs. The property is being developed pursuant to ZMAP 1984-0007 and ZMAP 1984-0329, Ashburn Village, in the PD-H4 (Planned Development-Housing) zoning district. The property is located within the AI (Airport Impact) Overlay District, outside of but within one (1) mile of the Ldn 60 aircraft noise contour. The modification to the sign regulations applicable to a Planned Development District is authorized by special exception under Section 6-1511(B)(5) and is reviewed in accordance with Section 5-1202(E). The subject property is approximately 27.4 acres in size and is located on the west side of Ashburn Village Boulevard (Route 2020), on the north side of Gloucester Parkway (Route 2150), and on the south side of Christiana Drive (Route 2019), at 44031, 44050, 44051, 44061, 44065, 44071, 44110, 44111, 44131, and 44151 Ashburn Shopping Plaza, Ashburn, Virginia, in the Broad Run Election District. The property is governed by the policies of the Revised General Plan (Suburban Policy Area (Ashburn Community)) which designate this area for Residential uses, and recommend residential development at densities up to 4 dwelling units per acre.

RECOMMENDATION

Planning Commission

At the July 14, 2010 Work Session, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Ruedisueli – absent) to forward the application to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval, subject to the Conditions of Approval dated July 14, 2010, excluding Condition # 6, and further as modified pertaining to the three sign types discussed at the meeting. Modifications included the following: 1) Limiting the second sign of an in-line / endcap tenant on a single façade to a logo only; 2) Consolidation and reduction of the aggregate sign area for ground-mounted restaurant and free-standing single tenant buildings; and 3) A reduction of the number of real estate signs.

Staff

This application has been revised consistent with the recommendations of the Planning Commission noted above. Notwithstanding, two Staff issues remain outstanding and include:

1. Elimination of ground-mounted signage for restaurants and free-standing single tenant buildings; and
2. The inclusion of a Condition of Approval, proposed at the Planning Commission Work Session by the Applicant as Condition # 6, which would allow the option for signage permitted by a future revision to the Ordinance as well as the option for by-right signage in lieu of modified signage.

The proposed Conditions of Approval, currently under review by the County Attorney's Office, are consistent with the recommendations of the Planning Commission and do not include Condition # 6. Should the Board opt to include Condition # 6, Staff recommends alternative language which would allow future sign types not currently permitted but restrict current signage only to that modified by this application. A discussion of Condition # 6, including the Applicant's proposal and the Staff's alternative, is included as part of the Planning Commission Recommendation on Page 9 and 10 of this report. At this time, Staff recommends the Board of Supervisors refer this application to the Transportation and Land Use Committee for further discussion.

SUGGESTED MOTIONS

1. I move that the Board of Supervisors forward ZMOD 2008-0010, Ashburn Village Shopping Center Comprehensive Sign Plan, to the Transportation and Land Use Committee for further discussion. *(A timeline extension from the Applicant will be necessary.)*

OR,

2. I move that the Board of Supervisors forward ZMOD 2008-0010, Ashburn Village Shopping Center Comprehensive Sign Plan, to the October 5, 2010 Business Meeting for action. *(A timeline extension from the Applicant will be necessary.)*

OR,

3. I move an alternate motion.

VICINITY MAP



Directions:

From Leesburg, take Route 7 east to Ashburn Village Boulevard. Turn right onto Ashburn Village Boulevard. The subject property will be on the right just before the intersection with Gloucester Parkway. Access is via Ashburn Village Boulevard or Gloucester Parkway.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Application Information	5
II.	Summary of Discussion	6
III.	Planning Commission Review and Recommendation	7
IV.	Conclusions.....	10
V.	Conditions of Approval.....	10
VI.	Project Review.....	11
A.	Context	11
B.	Summary of Outstanding Issues.....	11
C.	Overall Analysis.....	12
D.	Zoning Ordinance Criteria for Approval	15
VII.	Attachments.....	16

I. APPLICATION INFORMATION

APPLICANT

Saul Holdings Limited Partnership
Attn: Brian Downie, Vice President
7501 Wisconsin Avenue; Suite 1500
Bethesda, MD 20814-6522
301-986-6122

REPRESENTATIVE

Cooley Godward Kronish LLP
Attn: Jeff Nein
11951 Freedom Drive
Reston, VA 20190-5601
703-456-8103

APPLICANT'S REQUEST

A Zoning Ordinance Modification for a Comprehensive Sign Plan. This application was accepted on December 11, 2008.

LOCATION

Northwest quadrant of the Ashburn Village Boulevard / Gloucester Parkway intersection.

TAX MAP/PARCEL #s

/62/E/3//70A1B	MCPI: 085-10-4384
/62/E/3//70A1A	MCPI: 085-20-4208
/62/E/370A1A1A	MCPI: 085-29-9611
/62/E/5//70B1A	MCPI: 085-29-7520

ZONING

PD-H4 (Planned Development – Housing); administered as PD-CC-CC (Planned Development – Commercial Center – Community Center)

ACREAGE OF SITE

27.4 acres

SURROUNDING ZONING / LAND USES

	ZONING	PRESENT LAND USES
North	PD-H4	Single-Family Attached; Multifamily
South	PD-H4	Single-Family Detached; Single-Family Attached
East	PD-H4	Single-Family Detached
West	PD-H4	Single-family Detached; Single-Family Attached

II. SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Topic	Issues Reviewed and Status
Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conformance with <u>Revised General Plan</u>. Status: Unresolved. The collective impact of modifications to individual sign types will result in a total number of signs that is inconsistent with both the Residential designation and the intent of the shopping center to serve as the service-area based neighborhood center envisioned by the <u>Countywide Retail Policy Plan Amendment</u>. • Eliminate free-standing monument signage for individual restaurant pad sites (Exhibit 3A) and free-standing single tenant buildings (Exhibit 4A). Status: Unresolved. A maximum of three (3) signs are proposed for free-standing restaurant pad sites and free-standing single tenant buildings, one of which may be a ground-mounted monument sign. Given the application proposes five (5) monument entrance signs, three (3) real estate monument signs, free-standing signs for the day care center and automotive service station, monument signs for restaurants and free-standing single tenant buildings should be eliminated. Pad site signage should be limited to building-mounted signage only and pad site tenant names consolidated onto entrance signs. • Reduce the number of subtenant signs (Exhibit 2A) for the anchor tenant (i.e. Giant). Status: Resolved. The aggregate sign area for an anchor tenant has been reduced from 450 square feet to 250 square feet, and the total number of signs has been reduced from eight (8) to six (6). Subtenant signs were reduced from five (5) to two (2). • Reduce both the individual sign area and aggregate sign area of restaurant drive-through signs (Exhibit 3B), which, as proposed, are five times larger than what the Ordinance would allow. Status: Resolved. The sign area of the second drive-thru menu sign was reduced from seventy-five (75) feet to twenty (20) feet with a corresponding reduction in the aggregate sign area from 150 feet to ninety-five (95) feet. • Reduce the total number of Directional Signs (Exhibit 7B); specify a maximum number for the Property or a maximum number per pad site. Status: Resolved. Language was clarified such that only (4) signs would be permitted for a tenant with a drive thru service lane. The number of directional signs for a tenant without a drive thru was clarified and reduced from four (4) to two (2). • Limit the number of in-line (Exhibit 2B) and endcap (Exhibit 2C) building-mounted tenant signs to one (1) sign per tenant per façade; restrict signage on the rear of buildings. Status: Resolved. Two (2) building-mounted signs are proposed for in-line tenants and three (3) building-mounted signs are proposed for endcap tenants, however, the second and third signs, respectively, must be limited to the tenant's logo only. Signage on the rear of the building facing Christiana Drive has been prohibited.

Comprehensive Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the total number of Real Estate Signs (Exhibit 8A). Status: Resolved. The number of Real Estate signs was reduced from six (6) to three (3) with a stipulation that only one sign may be permitted along any single public right-of-way frontage at any one time. • Reduce the total number of second-story signage (Exhibits 2E and 2F); eliminate one of two sign categories. Status: Resolved. Second-story signage has been reduced from a worst case scenario of six (6) signs per façade to three (3) signs per façade.
Zoning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit a Comprehensive Sign package that is inclusive of all parcels located within the center. Status: Not an Issue. A 1.3 acre parcel, currently occupied by a Burger King restaurant, is not owned by the Applicant. All of other parcels under the Applicant's control are subject to the application. • Consolidate primary and secondary entrance signs as the Ordinance does not differentiate between the two. Status: Resolved. • Reduce the total number of directional signs and specify a maximum number of directional signs that may be on-site at any one time. Status: Resolved. • Reclassify directional signs as miscellaneous directional signs, on-site, pursuant to Section 5-1204(D)(7)(h). Status: Resolved. The application has been revised to reference the correct Ordinance section. • Clarify the intent behind requesting multiple sign types for the same pad (restaurant, child care center, auto service station, etc. signs are all being requested for the same pad); eliminate duplicate requests as only one sign type is permitted for each building pad. Status: Resolved; notations have been included stating only one sign type may be permitted per pad site at any one time. • Specify a maximum number of real estate signs. Status: Resolved. The application has been revised to specify a maximum of three (3) real estate signs at any one time. • Remove all temporary signs as they are not permitted by the <u>Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance</u> for commercial uses. Status: Resolved. Temporary signs that included balloons, banners, pennants, and inflated devices have been removed from the application. • Include lighting details for all signs intended to be "internally or externally illuminated." Status: Resolved. A note stating compliance with lighting standards which restrict glare on public roadways and adjoining properties has been included.

III. PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

On April 28, 2010, the Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on this application. One member of the public addressed the Commission, speaking on behalf of the Ashburn Village Homeowners Association, and indicated that though the Association was not opposed to the application, additional discussion with the Applicant was needed to address community concerns, notably the possibility of illuminated signage on the rear of the buildings facing Christiana Drive. Discussion from the Planning Commission included concerns about the

area of drive-thru signage, the number of proposed in-line tenant signage, and the number of real estate signs. The Applicant indicated an intent at the Public Hearing to amend the application to reduce the number and clarify the location of individual sign types. To allow for further discussion and to allow the applicant to submit a revised comprehensive sign plan, the Commission voted 9-0 to forward the application to Work Session.

Prior to the July 14, 2010 Work Session, the application was amended to provide further limitations on sign placement, particularly on the rear of buildings and along public right-of-way, and to reduce the number of second story building signs, the number of directional signs, and the area of drive-thru menu signs. Outstanding issues considered by the Commission included the following:

In-Line (Exhibit 2B) and Endcap Tenant (Exhibit 2C): Regarding the option for a second sign on a single façade, the Commission questioned the need for two signs and indicated concerns about repetitious signage. It was noted that proposed amendments to the sign regulations, currently under consideration by the Planning Commission, would limit signage to one (1) per façade. To avoid duplication, the Commission recommended that a second sign may be permitted on a single façade if it were limited to the tenant's logo only. Stipulations requiring a storefront to exceed thirty-five (35) linear feet to qualify for a second sign were retained; a fifteen (15) foot spacing limitation between the two signs was removed.

Restaurant (Exhibit 3A) and Free-Standing Single Tenant (Exhibit 4A) Ground-Mounted Monument Signs: The Planning Commission recognized that certain pad sites currently have a monument sign for existing tenants (i.e. Ruby Tuesday) and questioned the grand-fathering provisions should those signs no longer be permitted. The Commission was comfortable with the option for a monument sign, provided the individual and aggregate sign area were reduced and limitations were placed on Real Estate Monument signs, discussed subsequently. The Planning Commission recommended that the aggregate sign area for both free-standing and building-mounted signage be consolidated and specified as a combined one hundred (100) square feet¹ with the area of only one side of a double-sided monument sign counted towards the combined aggregate area.

Real Estate – Commercial For Sale/For Lease Sign – Retail or Office (Exhibit 8A): Given the request for multiple signs along a single right-of-way, the Planning Commission questioned the rationale for duplicate signage and inquired whether signage was the medium through which the target audience would be reached (i.e. do real estate brokers actually lease space in a shopping center by driving around and looking at signs). In an effort to reduce the total number of

¹ Prior to the Planning Commission Work Session, the comprehensive sign plan included an aggregate area for building mounted signage, one hundred (100) square feet, that was distinct from the aggregate area for free-standing signage, also one hundred (100) square feet. The cumulative impact, should a tenant opt for free-standing signage, would have been an aggregate sign area of two hundred (200) feet. That has now been reduced to a total of one hundred (100) feet.

signs and to off-set the allowance for ground-mounted monument signs described above, the Planning Commission recommended real estate monument signs be limited to a maximum of three (3) with a limitation that only one (1) sign may be permitted along any single public right-of-way frontage at any one time.

Following the discussion of the individual sign types, the Applicant proposed revised Conditions of Approval, dated July 14, 2010, that would allow for externally illuminated signage as well as the introduction of a new condition which would effectively permit future by-right signage. With regard to the latter, the language proposed by the Applicant was noted as Condition # 6 and included the following:

Condition # 6 Language as Proposed by the Applicant: "Signs not included in the Sign Plan, but otherwise permitted by the Zoning Ordinance, shall be permitted in accordance with the standards of the then Current Zoning Ordinance."

The Applicant indicated this language has been included as part of previously approved sign plans, and the intent was described as two-fold. First, this condition would allow the option for signage not currently permitted by the Ordinance but allowed at some point in the future, pending revisions to the sign regulations. Second, it would provide the option for by-right signage in addition to signage modified as part of this comprehensive sign plan. The Planning Commission was in agreement with a provision that would not preclude signage that may be permitted in the future. However, there was general concern about allowing by-right signage as an alternative to modified signage as it would provide for inconsistency and a lack of continuity that is in contradiction to the objective of a sign plan to be comprehensive in nature. The Planning Commission opted to not include this language and requested Staff to investigate to what extent similar language has been used in the past.

After discussion, the Planning Commission voted 8-0-1 (Ruedisueli – absent) to forward the application to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation of approval, subject to the Conditions of Approval dated July 14, 2010, excluding Condition # 6, and further as modified pertaining to the three sign types discussed at the meeting. The application has been revised consistent with the recommendations of the Planning Commission noted above, and the Conditions of Approval, now dated September 1, 2010, have been updated accordingly.

Attachment 1 is provided as a summary of the issues initially raised to the Planning Commission and which were resolved during the Commission's review. Not all of the issues resolved by the Commission were described in the discussion above.

Staff Recommendation Regarding Condition # 6

The language noted above and identified as Condition # 6 has been used in approved comprehensive sign plans, most recently Lansdowne Village Greens (ZMOD 2008-0009). Provisions for signage not yet permitted but which may be permitted pending revisions to the Ordinance is reasonable. However, options to provide by-right signage in lieu of modified signage may provide for inconsistencies in both size and design and would be in conflict with the intent of a comprehensive sign plan. Further, the Planning Commission recommended increases above the Ordinance standard for certain sign types in exchange for a

corresponding reduction below the Ordinance standard for other sign types (i.e. the allowance of ground-mounted monument signs for restaurants and free-standing single tenant buildings in exchange for a reduction in the number of real estate signs). Should the Applicant revert to by-right signage, there would be no assurance that those sign types modified below the Ordinance standards would be permitted as such. Should the Board opt to include Condition # 6, Staff recommends the language be clarified as follows to address these concerns:

Condition # 6 Language as Recommended by Staff: Sign categories not already modified as part of this Comprehensive Sign Plan but otherwise permitted by the Zoning Ordinance, shall be permitted in accordance with the standards of the then Current Zoning Ordinance. Signage permitted pursuant to this Condition shall utilize materials, colors, and illumination consistent with the standards included in the Sign Plan. In no instance shall by-right signage be allowed in lieu of a sign category modified as part of this Comprehensive Sign Plan.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

1. When considered collectively, the application proposes signage that is not indicative of a "service area-based retail" center, one that provides a community focus while fulfilling the convenience or routine shopping needs of area residents, but rather a center that caters to and is reliant upon the motoring public.
2. The sign modification establishes standards for the location, size, number, illumination, and color of proposed signage for the Ashburn Village Shopping Center.
3. The number and types of ground-mounted monument signage proposed for free-standing pad sites is not consistent with the Residential designation in that retail should be supportive of the adjoining community and not intended to attract "drive-by" traffic.

V. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL – September 1, 2010

The Planning Commission recommends the following conditions of approval:

1. Signs shall be provided in substantial conformance with the "Ashburn Village Shopping Center Comprehensive Sign Plan," dated November 24, 2008, revised August 4, 2010, prepared by LandDesign (the "Sign Plan").
2. Sign materials, colors, size, height, location, number, and lighting shall be provided in substantial conformance with the Sign Plan
3. Landscaping shall extend around the base of each monument sign a minimum of three feet (3') and shall consist of low-lying shrubbery and/or flowering plants. The use of native species shall be encouraged. All landscaping shall be maintained in good condition.

4. No animation, neon, or moving lights shall be permitted. Internally illuminated signs shall contain no exposed lighting elements. Lighting for externally illuminated signs will be directed toward the sign and all lighting fixtures will be shielded to not spill upward or reflect or cast glare onto adjacent properties or roadways.
5. Individual signs shall be maintained in good condition.

VI. PROJECT REVIEW

A. CONTEXT

On December 11, 2008, the County accepted, on behalf of Saul Holdings Limited Partnership, a request for Zoning Ordinance Modification (ZMOD) to implement a Comprehensive Sign Package, modifying the permitted number, size, height, location, and illumination of signage. The Comprehensive Sign Plan applies to the Ashburn Village Shopping Center, a community serving, neighborhood shopping center, anchored by a Giant Grocery Store, located within the Ashburn Village. The site is located in the northwest quadrant of the Ashburn Village Boulevard / Gloucester Parkway intersection and is accessible by both roads and also by Christiana Drive.

Ashburn Village was approved in April 1986 pursuant to ZMAP 1984-0007 and ZMAP 1984-0329. Site plans STPL 2000-0027 and STPL 2001-0071 were approved in June 2000 and January 2002, respectively, and allowed for the construction of the retail center and six (6) retail pad sites. STPL 2000-0039, Ashburn Tire Center, was approved in February 2001 and allowed for the construction of a 5,400 square foot automotive service center. With the exception of one pad site, which remains undeveloped, the center is completely built-out with a number of retail and service oriented uses.

B. SUMMARY OF OUTSTANDING ISSUES

Outstanding issues include the following:

1. ***Elimination of ground-mounted signage for restaurants and free-standing, single tenant buildings.*** Provisions for ground-mounted signage for each of the eight (8) pad sites would be in addition to ground-mounted entrance signage and real estate signage. The combination of all sign types may result in a proliferation of signage along roadways and suggest the center is catering to the motoring public as opposed to serving the convenience shopping needs of the surrounding neighborhoods.
2. ***A Condition (# 6) has been proposed by the Applicant which would allow signage not currently permitted by the Ordinance and the option for by-right signage in lieu of modified signage.*** Allowing signs types that may be permitted pending revisions to the Ordinance is reasonable. However, allowing the option to revert back to by-right signage as an alternative to utilizing signage modified as part of this application may result in inconsistencies both in size and design. Should the Board opt to include Condition # 6, Staff has suggested language as an alternative to that suggested by the Applicant on Page 10 of this report. The

Planning Commission was not comfortable recommending this Condition until the Language was further vetted by Staff.

C. OVERALL ANALYSIS

ZONING

The application is governed by the Revised 1993 Loudoun County Zoning Ordinance ("Ordinance"). The property is currently zoned PD-H4 (Planned Development – Housing), administered as PD-CC-CC (Planned Development – Commercial Center – Community Center).

Issues considered by Zoning Administration include the following: 1) Revision of all zoning ordinance citations to reference the property as being administered as PD-CC-CC, not PD-CC-RC (Planned Development – Commercial Center – Regional Center); 2) The consolidation of primary and secondary entrance signs as the Ordinance does not distinguish between the two signs types; 3) Clarification of the intent behind requesting multiple sign types, reflective of differing uses, for the same pad; 4) Removal of all temporary signs (i.e. balloons, banners, pennants, inflated devices, etc.) as such signs are not permitted by the Ordinance; 5) Commitments that community directional signs will not include advertising; 6) Reduction and clarification of the maximum number of both real estate signs and community directional signs; and 7) Submission of a Comprehensive Sign Package that is inclusive of all parcels within the center.

With the notable exception of the request to reduce the total number of community directional signs and the submission of a comprehensive sign package that includes all parcels, all of the issues noted above have been resolved. Regarding the submission of a comprehensive sign package inclusive of all parcels, staff acknowledges that Section 5-1202 (D) states that "...modifications to the sign regulations...shall include the submission of a Comprehensive Sign Package for the Planned Development District that clearly addresses how the proposed requirements satisfy the public purpose to an equivalent degree." In this instance, one parcel, a 1.3 acre parcel currently occupied by a Burger King restaurant, is not under the ownership of the Applicant and has elected not to participate in this application. As such, staff acknowledges the Ordinance provision but has not identified this as an outstanding issue as all parcels owned by the Applicant are included.

Regarding community directional signs, the application originally proposed four (4) community directional signs per tenant with no limitations on the maximum number specified. The open-ended nature of basing signage on tenants, a number that can easily fluctuate and increase as single-use buildings convert to multi-use buildings, could have resulted in excessive signage and visual clutter. As a means to address this issue, the sign type has been clarified to apply to single tenant buildings only and the number of directional signs for a tenant without a drive-thru service lane has been reduced to two (2) signs. As such, this issue has been resolved.

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The site is governed under the policies of the Revised General Plan (Plan). The site is located in the Ashburn Community of the Suburban Policy Area and is planned for Residential land uses according to the Planned Land Use Map (Revised General Plan, p. 7-23). The policies of the Countywide Retail Policy Plan Amendment (Retail Plan) also apply.

Areas designated as suitable for Residential will include housing as the principal function but are also anticipated to include "business and light/flex industrial uses" to ensure convenient access to support services and local employment. The Revised General Plan envisions that larger residential communities (i.e. Ashburn Village) will include a commercial component larger than one that would serve a single neighborhood. The Ashburn Village Shopping Center, located at the heart of Ashburn Village, surrounded by a mix of residential dwelling units, serves this function and is further defined by the Retail Plan as service area-based retail. Service-area based retail is described as neighborhood convenience, neighborhood, and community retail centers that "...provide a community focus while fulfilling the convenience or routine shopping needs..." of the area's residents. Such centers are not anticipated "...to attract 'drive-by' shoppers or function as destination retail."

In its analysis, Community Planning referenced that the modifications proposed through this application increase the size, location, and number of multiple sign types and appear to cater to the motoring public rather than serve the day-to-day convenience needs of the surrounding community. Originally, modifications proposed to individual sign types included a number of free-standing signs as well as building-mounted signs that, when considered collectively, represent a proliferation of signage within an area designated as suitable for and developed with Residential uses. In response to these concerns and through subsequent deliberation with the Planning Commission, signage was reduced both in number and aggregate area with further limitations on placement. Attachment 1 lists the sign types identified as outstanding issues at the Planning Commission along with a description of the applicant initiated revisions and revisions made in response to the recommendations of the Planning Commission that resolved each issue.

GROUND-MOUNTED PAD SITE SIGNAGE

One issue from Community Planning remains outstanding, the provisions for ground-mounted monument signs for both restaurants and free-standing single tenant buildings. Collectively, the application proposes a maximum of three (3) signs per free-standing restaurant and per free-standing single tenant structure, one of which may be a free-standing monument sign. The number of signs and the provision for a free-standing monument sign is consistent with that allowed by the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance, and Staff notes one existing restaurant, Ruby Tuesday, currently has a monument sign. The modification, as proposed, is applicable to the total aggregate square footage and the individual sign area.

Originally, an aggregate sign area was individually specified as one hundred (100) feet for any free-standing sign and one hundred (100) feet for building-mounted signage. A total aggregate sign area was not specified but would represent two hundred (200) feet, should a user opt for both free-standing and ground-mounted signage. This amount was identified by Staff as excessive as it represented signage three times that allowed by the Ordinance standard. Further, the provisions for a free-standing monument sign per pad site would be in

addition to two (2) primary identification signs, three (3) secondary identification signs, six (6) real estate monument signs, one (1) free-standing sign for the child care center, and (1) one free-standing sign for the automotive service station. The cumulative total of all signs may result in a proliferation of monument signs along roadways, suggesting that the center is catering to the motoring public rather than being the service-area based retail center it was intended. As such and given the increase in sign area, Staff recommended the free-standing signage be eliminated.

In response to this issue, the Applicant added language to the application that would prohibit no more than two free-standing signs within fifty (50) feet of each adjoining public right-of-way at any one time. The Planning Commission recommended the individual aggregate areas be consolidated and specified as a combined one hundred (100) feet. The Planning Commission further recommended that only the area of one side of a double-sided monument sign be counted against this aggregate area. The following table compares the signage allowed pursuant to the Ordinance versus the proposed modification.

Sign Exhibit 3A: Restaurant

	Revised 1993 Ordinance Standard		Proposed Modification
	Up to 4,000 square feet	Over 4,000 square feet	Two categories combined
Aggregate Sign Area	60 square feet	120 square feet	100 square feet
Individual Sign Area	20 square feet for any one sign; 30 square feet for free-standing sign plus 1.5 multiplier	30 square feet for any free-standing sign plus 1.5 multiplier; 60 square feet of any one building mounted sign	60 square feet for building mounted; 100 square feet for free-standing.
Number of Signs	Maximum of 3 signs	Maximum of 3 signs	Maximum of 3 signs

Sign Exhibit 4A: Freestanding Building – Single Tenant

	Revised 1993 Ordinance Standard	Proposed Modification
Aggregate Sign Area	2 square feet per linear foot of storefront; 60 square feet maximum	100 square feet
Individual Sign Area	60 square feet	60 square feet for building mounted; 100 square feet for free-standing.
Number of Signs	1 sign per façade; maximum of 3 signs	Maximum of 3 signs

The application has been revised consistent with the recommendations of the Planning Commission. **Staff continues to recommend, however, the elimination of ground-mounted signage given that the aggregate area, though reduced, represents an increase from that allowed by the Ordinance. This increase in area combined with the number of other ground-mounted signs imply that this center is one that caters to the motoring public rather than serving the localized shopping needs of neighboring communities. Staff recommends signage for pad sites be limited to building-mounted signage only and pad site tenant names be consolidated with entrance signage, noted previously as primary and secondary identification signs.**

D. ZONING ORDINANCE CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL

Section 6-1310 states "... (i)in considering a special exception application, the following factors shall be given reasonable consideration, to the extent applicable, in addition to any other standards imposed by this Ordinance ..."

Standard *The glare or light that may be generated by the proposed use in relation to uses in the immediate area.*

Analysis The Ashburn Village Shopping Center Comprehensive Sign Plan proposes light that is both internally and externally illuminated. A condition of approval has been proposed that will limit glare and light trespass to nearby or adjacent properties.

Standard *The proposed location, lighting, and types of signs in relation to the proposed use, uses in the area, and the sign requirements of this Ordinance.*

Analysis The proposal provides a comprehensive sign plan for the Ashburn Village Shopping Center. However, modifications have been proposed that would increase both the area of free-standing monument signs such that compatibility to adjacent residential uses cannot be guaranteed.

Standard *Whether the proposed special exception at the specified location will contribute to or promote the welfare and convenience of the public.*

Analysis The proposed signs will help guide the motoring public to the Ashburn Village Shopping Center. However, the number of signs proposed along roadway frontages is considered excessive and may be considered visual clutter.

VII. ATTACHMENTS	PAGE NUMBER
1. Overall Analysis – Comprehensive Plan Contd.	A-1
2. Review Agency Comments	
a. Planning Department, Community Planning	A-5
b. Building and Development, Zoning Administration	A-19
3. Disclosure of Real Parties in Interest	A-25
4. Applicant's Response to Referral Agency Comments	A-55
5. Statement of Justification	A-71
6. Ashburn Village Shopping Center Comprehensive Sign Plan	Attached

NOTE: Attachments are available electronically, and may be viewed at the Planning Department Front Counter or in the Building & Development File Room.